UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,772	04/16/2004	Tomonori Tominaga	52433/763	1288
7590 04/17/2007 Robert T. Tobin KENYON & KENYON One Broadway New York, NY 10004			EXAMINER	
			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			<u>-</u>	
SHORTENED STATUTO	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/826,772	TOMINAGA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Scott Kastler	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet t	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC a. cause the application to become a	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 F	ebruary 2007.					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 18-35 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 18-35 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers	·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b)∭ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in a rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		•				
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/27/07.	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 1742

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either of Statnikov'726 or Prokopenko et al. Each of Statnikov'726 or Prokopenko et al in their respective claims for example, teach a workpiece in which fatigue life is improved through the use of ultrasonic impact treatment, thereby showing all aspects of the above claim since in a product by process claim, such as instant claim 35, the process employed cannot be relied upon to lend patentability to the claim unless it can be shown that the process steps result in a materially different product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berkley in view of Statnikov'726 or Prokopenko et al. Berkley teaches a method and final product in which the fatigue life of the product is improved through the steps of selection, or identification of a part to be treated, performance of a "pretreatment" in the form of non-destructive testing of the

Art Unit: 1742

type described by the instant dependant claims, performing a treatment that modifies residual stress to reduce fatigue, although no specific type of treatment is recited, and then performing a quality assurance test meeting the requirements of the instant claims, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except the specific application of an ultrasonic impact treatment as the residual stress treatment step. Each of Statnikov'726 or Prokopenko et al teach that ultrasonic impact treatments were known in the art at the time the invention was made as desirable treatment for the modification of residual stresses to reduce fatigue. Because residual stress modification is the desired objective of the treatment required, but not specified by Berkley, motivation to employ ultrasonic impact treatments, as disclosed by both of Statnikov'726 or Prokopenko et al as known for the purpose of modifying residual stress in order to improve fatigue strength, as the treatment required by Berkley, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the response, filed on 2/23/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of newly presented claim(s) 18-35 under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the Berkley, Statnikov'726 and Prokopenko et al references as applied above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/826,772

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Scott Kastler **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 1742